



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,742	01/12/2001	Ralf Hofmann	P-4356	9744

7590

11/01/2005

Forrest Gunnison  
GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.  
GARDEN WEST OFFICE PLAZA, SUITE 220  
1900 GARDEN ROAD  
MONTEREY, CA 93940

EXAMINER

QUELER, ADAM M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/759,742

Applicant(s)

HOFMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Adam M. Queler

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7-10,13 and 15-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7-10,13 and 15-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 08/10/2005
2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-10, 13, 15-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 13, 18, 20, 21, and 24 are independent claims.
3. The rejection of claims 3, 13 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are withdrawn in view Applicant's arguments.

#### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/10/2005 has been entered.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. **Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

The term "generic data format independent interface" is an indefinite limitation. The specification defines the "generic format independent interface" has a subset of an API, but does not provide any details how this limits the interface. Of question is how independent are the formats. The filters themselves are for transforming data to different formats. While it appears

Art Unit: 2178

they are intended to have XML as the independent format, XHTML and XSL are two different formats of XML. Even interfaces that deal with a byte stream could deal with independent formats, such as a Word document or PDF file. The only real meaning given to the term (which cannot be read into the claims) is that it permits transfer of data from one filter to another.

Therefore, for examining purposes only, that meaning will be considered.

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: Using the comparison in some manner. The two formats are compared but the comparison results are not included in the claim language.

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. **Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.**

The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. If it is not known what is meant by a “generic data format independent interface”, as indicated above, then it seems unlikely that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to make or use such an interface with out undue experimentation.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**11. Claims 1, 8-10, 18-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bayeh et al. (US006012098A patented 1/4/2000). Zeiger, "Servlet Essentials" is cited as evidence regarding servlets.**

**Regarding independent claim(s) 1, 10, and 13,** Bayeh teaches receiving a request for data (col. 4, ll. 23-29). Bayeh teaches retrieving a rule set for a plurality of filters, or servlets, (col. 9, ll. 46-63). The plain meaning of a filter registry, when viewed in light of the specification, is the location of the rule set, which inherently the rule set must be retrieved from. Upon being chained, the filters convert source data to requested data (col. 4, ll. 23-37). Bayeh teaches the filter is a chain of partial filters, each of which as a generic format independent interface that passes data from one to another (col. 9, ll. 30-46). Zeiger is cited as further evidence to that effect. Bayeh teaches that a subset of the data is processed (col. 12, ll. 7-12).

**Regarding independent claim(s) 24,** Bayeh teaches receiving a request for data (col. 4, ll. 23-29). Bayeh teaches supporting different formats and selecting the second format (col. 8, ll. 55-57). Bayeh teaches generating a filter by combining a first filter with a second filter (col. 9, ll. 30-45). Bayeh teaches a using an XSL style sheet to transform the one format to the other. As each element must be mapped to the other format, this broadly encompasses a comparison of the two formats. Bayeh teaches the filter converts source data from a first format to a second data format (col. 4, ll. 37-42).

**Regarding independent claim(s) 8 and 18,** Bayeh teaches receiving a request for data (col. 4, ll. 23-29). Bayeh teaches a partial filter library as part of the server (col. 7, ll. 36-38). Bayeh

Art Unit: 2178

teaches retrieving a rule set for a plurality of filters, or servlets, (col. 8, ll. 36-64), wherein upon being chained the filters convert source data to requested data (col. 4, ll. 23-37). This chain of filters is the general partial filter adapter as set forth in the claim language. Bayeh teaches the filter is a chain of partial filters, each of which as a generic format independent interface that passes data from one to another (col. 9, ll. 30-46). Bayeh teaches input to the filter is a XSL style-sheet that determines its functionality (col. 9, ll. 4-6). As the filter is a servlet object, its input is passed through a parameter.

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 9 and 19**, Bayeh teaches input to the filter is a XSL style-sheet that determines its functionality (col. 9, ll. 4-6). As the filter is a servlet object, its input is passed through a parameter. As the filter processes an XSL stylesheet, equivalent to a transformation script, it is deemed to be an XSL processor.

**Regarding independent claim(s) 20**, Bayeh teaches a partial filter library as part of the server (col. 7, ll. 36-38). Bayeh teaches retrieving a rule set for a plurality of filters, or servlets, (col. 8, ll. 36-64), wherein upon being chained the filters convert source data to requested data (col. 4, ll. 23-37). The remainder of the components of the structure have no function claimed, and therefore are considered non-functional descriptive data. See MPEP § 2112.01.III.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**13. Claims 3, 5, 13, 15-16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayeh.**

**Regarding independent claim(s) 3, 13 and 21,** Bayeh teaches receiving a request for data (col. 4, ll. 23-29). Bayeh teaches a partial filter library as part of the server (col. 7, ll. 36-38). Bayeh teaches retrieving a rule set for a plurality of filters, or servlets, (col. 8, ll. 36-64), wherein upon being chained the filters convert source data to requested data (col. 4, ll. 23-37). Bayeh teaches the filter is a chain of partial filters, each of which as a generic format independent interface that passes data from one to another (col. 9, ll. 30-46). Bayeh teaches the filter converts source data from a first format to a second data format (col. 4, ll. 37-42).

Additionally, Bayeh teaches the client is a browser (col. 2, ll. 25-36). Bayeh does not disclose a specific browser; therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly turn toward an accepted browser at the time of the invention. Official Notice is taken, that most browsers at the time of the invention supported a plurality of formats, including at least HTML and text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to turn to the prior art for a browser as indicated by Bayeh.

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 5 and 15,** Bayeh teaches selecting a particular servlet based on whether or not it is busy (col. 8, ll. 43-48). This amounts to a selection scheme that takes into account conversion time, since pickling a non-busy servlet would decrease conversion time.

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 16,** Bayeh teaches the filter converts source data from a first format to a second data format (col. 4, ll. 37-42).

Art Unit: 2178

**14. Claims 7, 17, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayeh as applied to claims 1, 13, and 21 above, and further in view of Garshol, "Free XML Software", (12/15/199).**

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 7, 17, and 22,** Bayeh does not teach a Simple API for XML.

Garshol teaches a Simple API for XML (p. 22), which includes a plurality of filters that can accept the input and output of themselves (p. 24, "Parser Filters"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace Bayeh's servlets with Garshol's filters, as SAX was a de facto standard at the time of the invention (p. 22, "SAX").

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 23,** SAX's interface is inherently an XML document handler interface, as proven at least by Applicant's specification (p. 39).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

**15.** Applicant's arguments filed 08/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Regarding Applicant's remarks on Claim(s) 1, 3, 5, 10, 13, 15-17, and 21:**

Applicant alleges that a library is not a registry. The Office did not intend to equate the two; rather the library was cited as further explanation of the rejection. It has been removed and the registry more expressly recited in the rejection.

Applicant alleges that a generic data format independent interface is not taught by Bayeh. Applicant states, "The fact that an applet has an API teaches nothing about how that API transfers data or even that each applet has the same API." The Office assumes the Applicant means the cited servlets, however, in either case the servlets and applets are APIs themselves. Every servlet does have the same API, as that is they're primary function to provide a standard



Art Unit: 2178

interface. The Office has added a technical reference about servlets to the anticipation rejection in the event that other alleged deficiencies in Bayeh's servlets may need to be inherently shown. In either event, what is exactly meant by this term is unclear as noted in the §112 rejections above, and the interface of Bayeh does meet the interface of the specification.

**Regarding Applicant's remarks on Claim(s) 8, 9, 18, 19:**

Applicant alleges that claim 8 was not examined on its own merits. The Office notes that the rejection of the claim recites some similar parts as the rejection of claim 1, as much as the claim 8 recites similar elements of claim 1, however, the rejections are different.

**Regarding Applicant's remarks on claim(s) 20:**

Applicant alleges that the holding of non-functional descriptive data is improper, and requests a citation to the MPEP. Please see MPEP § 2112.01.III.

**Regarding Applicant's remarks on claim 24:**

Applicant alleges Bayeh does not teach a comparison. The rejection has been explained in more detail. However, it is noted that the claim does not actually teach using the results of this comparison in constructing the filter.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M. Queler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AQ



**STEPHEN HONG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**